

DISCOVERY SITE EVALUATION CHECKLIST

(To be completed by a member of ERC Data Management and included with the data package for a newly discovered potential waste management unit.)

Site Code: 200-W-31

1/7/98

Site Alias(es): 200-W-31, 218-W-2A Borrow Pit

Waste Management Unit	Not a Waste Management Unit	More Information Needed
<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

1. Does the unit receive uncontaminated rainwater runoff only? y ☐ n ☒

IF YES, CHECK "NOT A WASTE MANAGEMENT UNIT" ABOVE AND STOP. IF NO, GO TO 2.

A check in any "YES" box below indicates the site is a waste management unit as defined in Section 3.1 of the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA). (Items 2 through 7 below correspond with the six waste management unit types found in the TPA definition.)

2. Complete items 2.a through 2.f below to determine if the unit is a solid waste management unit (SWMU) as specified under Section 3004(u) of RCRA.

2.a. Is the material at the unit a waste? (i.e., a regulated waste or a discarded material, including garbage, refuse, sludge, construction/demolition debris, industrial/sanitary wastewater or other discarded solid, liquid, semisolid, or contained gas) y ☐ n ☒

IF NO, CHECK NO AND GO TO 3. IF YES, GO TO 2.b.

2.b. Is the waste from historical residential activities? (i.e., not from industrial, commercial, mining, agricultural, or community activities) y ☐ n ☐

2.c. Is the unit an industrial wastewater point discharge permitted under the Clean Water Act? (i.e., National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit) y ☐ n ☐

2.d. Does the waste consist ONLY of source, special nuclear, or byproduct material regulated by the Atomic Energy Act? y ☐ n ☐

A YES TO ANY OF THE ABOVE QUESTIONS INDICATES THE SITE IS NOT A SWMU. IF SO, CHECK NO AND GO TO 3. IF ALL ARE NO,

2.e. Was the waste placed in a discernable unit? (i.e., a landfill, surface impoundment, land treatment unit, waste pile, tank, container storage area, incinerator, injection well, wastewater treatment unit, waste recycling unit, or other physical, chemical, or biological treatment unit) y ☐ n ☐

IF YES, CHECK YES AND GO TO 3. IF NO, GO TO 2.f.

2.f. Is the unit the result of routine and systematic discharges? (i.e., areas receiving small but steady discharges over time from systematic human activity, such as from loading/unloading operations, solvent washing, industrial process sewer systems, etc.) y ☐ n ☐

IF YES, CHECK YES. IF NO, CHECK NO. GO TO 3.

YES NO

☐ ☒

RECEIVED
JUN 12 2000

EDMC

Site Code: 200-W-31

1/7/98

3.	Is the unit a waste disposal unit? (Complete items 3.a and 3.b below)	YES	NO
3.a.	Does the unit require a RCRA permit for the disposal of dangerous or mixed waste? y <input type="radio"/> n <input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
3.b.	Have hazardous wastes or substances been disposed of in a burial ground, pit, pond, ditch, crib, trench, french drain, or land surface that is not subject to regulation as a RCRA disposal unit and may require action to mitigate a potential environmental impact? (e.g., radioactive waste disposal units, pre-RCRA units) y <input type="radio"/> n <input checked="" type="radio"/> IF EITHER IS YES, CHECK YES. IF BOTH ARE NO, CHECK NO. GO TO 4.		
4.	Is the unit an unplanned release that has not been adequately cleaned up and represents a potential threat to human health or the environment? (i.e., releases above CERCLA reportable quantities defined in 40 CFR 302.4; other hazardous substance releases, including petroleum, that may require action to mitigate a potential environmental impact)	YES	NO
5.	Is the unit an inactive, contaminated structure?	YES	NO
6.	Does the unit require a RCRA permit for the treatment or storage of dangerous or mixed waste?	YES	NO
7.	Is the unit another type of storage unit that may require action to mitigate a potential environmental impact? (e.g., radioactive waste storage unit)	YES	NO

Comments: No waste was put in the borrow pit.

Christine Webb
ERC Data Management Investigator
Joseph P. Zoric
Regulatory Compliance Concurrence

1-7-98
Date
1-19-98
Date

FOR SITES REQUIRING DOE-RL AND REGULATOR REVIEW PER SECTION 5.2 OF RL-TPA-90-0001, TPA-MG-08

Raymond L. Sely
DOE-RL Concurrence
Walter J. Soper
Lead Regulatory Agency Concurrence

4/26/00
Date
4-26-00
Date